IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

Robert Lee Reynolds, II,)	C/A NO. 4:07-1724-CMC-TER
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
V.)	
J. Neal, Warden John J. Lamanna, Ray)	
Holt, and Harrell Watts,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On April 25, 2008, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on May 8, 2008.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

4:07-cv-01724-CMC Date Filed 05/12/08 Entry Number 41 Page 2 of 2

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28

U.S.C. § 636(b).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff's objections, the court agrees with the

conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and

Recommendation by reference in this Order. Plaintiff's objections are merely repetitive of the

arguments which were assessed and rejected by the Magistrate Judge, offering no persuasive legal

authority to indicate the Magistrate Judge erred in his analysis of the motions and Plaintiff's

complaint.

Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **granted** and this matter is dismissed with

prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina May 12, 2008

C:\Documents and Settings\guest\Local Settings\Temp\notesE1EF34\07-1724 Reynolds v. Neal e adopt rr gr sumigm.wpd

2